

Remarks/Arguments

Claims 1-20 are pending in this application, and are rejected in the non-final Office Action of October 11, 2011. Claims 1, 9 and 15 are amended herein to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter regarded as the invention.

Re: Patentability of Claims 1-18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,206,853 issued to Eytchison et al. (hereinafter, "Eytchison") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,559,549 issued to Hendricks et al. (hereinafter, "Hendricks"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

One notable aspect of the present invention relates to the functionality of a television apparatus that is operative to communicate with, and provide displays uniquely associated with, peripheral devices connected to the television apparatus via a digital serial bus, while also tuning and outputting content from an input source that is not connected to the digital serial bus (see, for example, page 11, lines 13-17 of Applicants' specification). Amended independent claim 1 recites:

"A method for displaying on a television apparatus, content information associated with peripheral devices interconnected with the television apparatus via a digital serial bus, the method comprising:
tuning, by the television apparatus, to a currently selected input source that is not connected to the digital serial bus;
receiving, by the television apparatus, and while the television apparatus is tuned to the currently selected input source, a user request to view content information associated with a selected peripheral device interconnected to the television apparatus via the digital serial bus;
retrieving, by the television apparatus from the selected peripheral device, responsive to said user request, the content information of the selected peripheral device via the digital serial bus; and
displaying, by the television apparatus, the retrieved content information for the selected peripheral device while the television apparatus is tuned to the currently selected input source, wherein the retrieved content information is displayed on a content display uniquely associated with the selected peripheral device." (emphasis added)

Independent claims 9 and 15 are also amended herein and recite features similar to independent claim 1 above.

Neither Eytchison nor Hendricks, whether taken individually or in combination, discloses or suggests each and every feature of independent claims 1, 9 and 15.

In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner admits the following deficiencies with respect to the primary reference, Eytchison:

“... Eytchison does not disclose that the TV is tuned to another program while the TV displays screen 80, and the viewer is going through the menu options at his/her disposal, therefore he is silent on tuning, by the television, to a currently selected input source; while obtaining and displaying content information from selected peripheral devices.” (see page 7 of Office Action; bold original; underlining added herein for emphasis)

Based on at least the foregoing admissions, Applicants submit that the primary reference, Eytchison, clearly fails to disclose or suggest, *inter alia*, the underlined features above herein as recited by independent claim 1 (and similarly recited by independent claims 9 and 15).

The second reference, Hendricks is unable to remedy the aforementioned deficiencies of Eytchison. In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner specifically cites column 18, lines 11-58 of Hendricks which relate to program overlay menus. The cited portion of Hendricks describes the program overlay menus 130 and various submenus that can be overlayed onto the portions of the displayed video. These menus are generated by the set top terminal 220 (col. 18, lines 48-49). It appears the menus relate to services available from the service provider through the set top terminal, which provides the video programming. However, the cited teachings of Hendricks fail to disclose or suggest, *inter alia*, a television apparatus that is operative to communicate with, and provide displays uniquely associated with, peripheral devices connected to the television apparatus via a digital serial bus, while also tuning content

from an input source that is not connected to the digital serial bus, as provided by the claimed invention. Accordingly, even if the teachings of Eytchison and Hendricks are combined, as proposed, the resulting combination still does not disclose or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention.

Therefore, for at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that claims 1-18 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over the proposed combination of Eytchison and Hendricks, and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Re: Patentability of Claims 19-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Eytchison in view of Hendricks, and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0060641 by Sezan et al. (hereinafter, "Sezan"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Sezan is unable to remedy the deficiencies of Eytchison and Hendricks discussed above in connection with independent claims 1 and 15 (from which claims 19-20 ultimately depend). Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that claims 19-20 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over the proposed combination of Eytchison, Hendricks and Sezan, and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intention to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in

this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Having fully addressed the Examiner's rejections it is believed that, in view of the preceding amendments and remarks, this application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully solicited. If, however, the Examiner is of the opinion that such action cannot be taken, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' attorney at (609) 734-6815, so that a mutually convenient date and time for a telephonic interview may be scheduled.

No fee is believed due from this response. However, if a fee is due, and if not already charged, please charge such fee, and credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 07-0832.

Respectfully submitted,

/Paul P. Kiel/

By: Paul P. Kiel
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 40,677

Date: 1/5/12

Patent Operations
Thomson Licensing LLC
P.O. Box 5312
Princeton, New Jersey 08543-5312